

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 12 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 12 have been amended in order to better define the present invention. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan et al. in view of Shirriff. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The present invention as claimed in claim 1 is directed to providing a method of notifying of a transition of updates of data that includes detecting updates of data which have not been notified, extracting a difference between the data before and after each of the updates which have not been notified, accumulating the difference of the data as a notification content, notifying the notification content at predetermined timings, and placing the accumulated differences in the notification content in order of the updates. See, for example, representative FIGS. 8 and 17).

The Examiner agreed in the first Office Action that Rajan et al. does not specifically disclose extracting a difference between the data before and after each of the update which have not been notified.

Shirriff discloses a web site monitoring system storing summary pages of updated content from the user specified web sites at desired frequency (columns [0039], [0054]). Shirriff also discloses displaying a web page 460 containing information (text 470 (or 480)) of the stored summary pages (column [0060]). Shirriff further discloses comparing content currently retrieved from the monitored web sites with the last retrieved content from these web sites to determine whether there has a change in the content (column [0055]). Shirriff, however, does not disclose accumulating the change in the content at the desired frequency and displaying the accumulated changes in order of the updates as the information contained in the web page 460, nor does Shirriff disclose or suggest notifying the accumulated changes as a notification content at predetermined timings whether or not the user accesses the user specified web site.

In view of the above, neither reference, taken singly or in combination, discloses or suggests all of the elements of the claim at issue. Accordingly, the combination of references cannot form the basis for finding the claims prima facie obvious as required under 35 U.S.C. 103. The rejection of the claims is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, and 12 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

28 JANUARY 2008
DATE

/Marc A. Rossi/
MARC A. ROSSI
REG. NO. 31,923

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)